

Appl. No. : 10/728,063
Filed : December 4, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 5-14, 22, and 23 are now pending in the present application, Claims 15-17 and 19-21 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. On these pages, the deletions are in ~~strikeout~~ or ~~[[double-brackets]]~~ while the insertions are underlined.

In response to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2006, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Claim 22 is Not Objectionable

Claim 22 stands objected to for containing one informality; a misspelling of the word "can." In order to expedite prosecution of the present Application, Applicants have amended Claim 10 to make this claim more easily readable and not to affect or narrow its scope. Thus, Applicants submit that all of the equivalents of the original recitations of Claim 22 are also equivalents of the present recitations of Claims 22.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended line 3 of Claim 22 to change the word "con" to "can." Applicants thus submit that the outstanding objection to Claim 22 is now moot.

Claims 19-21 Fully Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner indicating that the subject matter of these claims is not disclosed in the present specification sufficiently to satisfy the Written Description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claims 19-21 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicants expressly reserve the right to further prosecute the original versions of Claims 19-21 through continuation practice.

Kleeman et al. Does Not Anticipate Claims 15 or 16

Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kleeman et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claims 15 and 16 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicants expressly reserve the right to further prosecute the original versions of Claims 15 and 16 through continuation practice.

Appl. No. : 10/728,063
Filed : December 4, 2003

The Proposed Combination of Kleeman et al/Powers Does Not Make Claim 17 Obvious

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kleeman et al. in view of Powers. Applicants respectfully traverse the present rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicants have canceled Claim 17 without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the present rejection is now moot. Applicants expressly reserve the right to further prosecute the original versions of Claim 17 through continuation practice.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. If there is any further hindrance to allowance of the pending claims, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: October 24, 2006

By: 

Michael A. Guiliana
Registration No. 42,611
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

2698437
102406